

E

671

. @ 88



Class E 671

Book .C 88

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE;— WHO DEFEND
THE ADMINISTRATION?

SPEECH
OF
HON. S. S. COX,

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

AUGUST 8, 1876,

IN ANSWER TO

MESSRS. HALE AND CANNON.

“Am I a lord? and have I such a lady?
Or do I dream? or have I dream'd till now?
I do not sleep; I see, I hear, I speak;
I smell sweet savors, and I feel soft things;
Upon my life, I am a lord, indeed;
And not a tinker, nor Christopher Sly,
Well, bring our lady hither to our sight;
And once again, a pot o' the smallest ale.”
Christopher Sly, in the Mock Duke.

WASHINGTON:

1876.

Government printing office

U. S. 29 211

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. COX.

The House having under consideration the motion of Mr. HALE to reconsider the vote referring the President's message on the sundry civil bill.

Mr. COX said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I could not in five minutes, as I hoped, reply to such a magnificent and hefty speech as that just made by the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. HALE.] [Laughter.] In the history of our Government, from its beginning down, have we ever seen such a collection of particular and minute things which make up so little in the aggregate? [Laughter.] The gentleman did not refer to the whales, but to the minnows. [Laughter.] Why did he not refer to the unloading of General Grant and his administration and to the various frauds connected with the Executive Departments? That was not in his line; but he charged upon this House that it had actually, in some small instances, reformed itself. Did he not charge that one committee with the aid of its chairman, my distinguished friend from Illinois, [Mr. MORRISON,] had dismissed its clerk, and that the Committee on Rules had dismissed two men, one a journal clerk and the other a doorkeeper, for certain improprieties? No thievery was charged on these men, and no thievery proved, and no one believed that they were thieves.

ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES.

If the worst that can be said of this House and its organization is that the committees were made badly and sectionally against the North by our absent, lamented, and distinguished Speaker, then the opposition is most unhappy. I cannot compare our incomparable Speaker and the committees made by him with Mr. Ex-Speaker Blaine, of Maine, and his committees. But I will say that in the last Congress, out of thirty-seven chairmanships, only seven were given to the South, and those very inconsequential; so that now if the South has a fair share of chairmen, it is but a compensation for the past.

Mr. DURHAM. Just one moment. Out of forty-four only seven were given to the South.

Mr. COX. I am corrected. Out of forty-four only seven were given to the South by the Speaker from Maine, [Mr. Blaine.] Of course my friend from Maine [Mr. HALE] would not or did not look that up. But mere chairmanships of committees are not important, for I have been a chairman myself. [Laughter.] The point is, how are committees made as to majorities and business. That is the point. From it is seen the patriotic or partisan animus.

The fact is that my friend's theory about the making up of committees in this Congress by Mr. Speaker KERR is not borne out by the facts. You must look not to the chairman, but to the majority of a

committee, to find the essential elements and voice of a committee which direct both the action of the committee and to a great extent that of the House.

But I arose, sir, principally for the purpose of calling attention to the unsectional and fair constitution of the committees of this Congress, so as to repel the aspersions of the gentleman from Maine. And how are they?

The Committee of Elections have a majority from the North; the Committee of Ways and Means have also a majority of one from the North; the Committee on Appropriations have seven from the North to four from the South. I wish the House would notice that by the North I mean above Mason and Dixon's line, and how badly the gentleman from Maine has interpreted the unsectional action of Mr. Speaker KERR. The Committee on Banking and Currency have nine from the North to two from the South; the Committee on the Pacific Railroads, which was mentioned by the gentleman [Mr. HALE] in a peculiar way, have seven from the North to four from the South; the Committee of Claims have seven from the North to four from the South; and, by the way, most of these war claims, of which they have jurisdiction and to which sinister reference was made, are owned by northern men; four-fifths of them.

A MEMBER. All of them loyal men.

Mr. COX. Yes, speculators who bought them up; and, gentlemen on the other side, you know it. [Laughter.] I do not know a man from New England who has not a little speculative turn. [Laughter.] The Committee on Commerce have seven from the North to four from the South. My friend from Maine is interested in commerce and shipping, and the committee on that subject have seven from the North and four from the South. He cannot complain of this arrangement. We have not revived shipping yet, because we have not passed our reform tariff bill to take the tax off of certain articles which enter into a ship. But some day or other, when Governor Tilden is President, we will revive shipping in Maine and elsewhere, in spite of the exacting and destructive policies of the republican party.

I am going over the committees in their order. Upon the Committee on the Public Lands there are nine North to two South. On the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads they are six North to five South. On the Committee for the District of Columbia they are eight to three. On the important Committee on the Judiciary they are eight to three. On the Committee on War Claims, let it be remembered that there are seven North to four South. On the Committee on Public Expenditures they are six to five. On the Committee on Private Land Claims they are five to four.

Here let me pause on the next. It is the Committee on Manufactures. Well, what do they do? Have they ever met or reported? What are they constituted for? The Speaker of our House has actually given a majority of one to the South on that committee! No, I beg pardon; he has made them even, five to five. That is the only lead I have struck as yet where there is not a majority of northern men. Why should not the North, which has predominance in population and interests, have a predominant voice on the committees?

Upon the Committee on Agriculture there are six North to five South; and yet the fruits of the soil, cotton, grain, &c., are not all North. Upon the Committee on Indian Affairs they are as seven to five. Upon the Committee on Military Affairs there are seven to four. Upon the Committee on the Militia, six to five; upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, seven to four; upon the Committee on Foreign

Affairs they are eight to three; upon the Committee on the Territories they are nine to three; upon the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions they are seven to four; upon the Committee on Invalid Pensions there are six North to five South; upon the Committee on Railways and Canals they are six to five; upon the Committee on Mines and Mining they are eight to three.

The next is the Committee on Education and Labor. Now, if I had been the Speaker of this House I think I would have given a majority to the South on that committee; and would not my friend from Maine have done so? Why? Because we are trying to educate the "wards of the nation," by the help of the Peabody fund and public lands. We have bills to donate Federal property for a noble, educational, and humanitarian purpose. My friend from Virginia [Mr. WALKER] has reported such a bill. Well, sir, that committee is the first I have met, upon which there is a majority of southern men. They are five North to six South! Is this any wonderful goodness in our Speaker! The distinguished ex-governor of Virginia, born in the North, is the chairman of the committee. Who can complain of his designation as chairman? He has reported from that committee a measure designed to promote the education of the colored children of the nation. He has placed it on the basis of illiteracy, and in spite of northern prejudices. I think you cannot complain of the constitution of that committee, on the ground that it is sectionally southern and African. It ought to be southern; and so it is made.

Upon the Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the United States there are nine North to two South. The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures are seven to three. The Committee on Patents are six to five. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, seven to four. The North still predominates.

COST AND UTILITY OF INVESTIGATIONS.

Upon the Committee of Accounts they are four North to one South. And what a splendid Committee of Accounts we have in this House! [Laughter.] How the chairman of that committee will carry out economies when he becomes governor of the State of Indiana! [Laughter.] I challenge my friend from Maine when he goes to Indiana to stump for Governor Hayes to take up and scrutinize the accounts of this Congress under the auspices and vigilance of our chairman of accounts. He says that they will amount to a million dollars. He will find that under the management of our blue-jean governor they have been well expended, just and fair. When the gentleman complains that we have been expensive this session he must remember the great expense that has been incurred in investigations. He says \$1,000,000. He must remember who caused the investigations. It is a mere guess as to the amount, however. Why, sir, suppose the amount true; it would pay us if we spent five millions. We need it as an example to future Houses and future officers in the conduct of the public business. We need to spend much as a preventive of fraud. Shall we not examine into and develop fraud because it costs money? Why, my friend from Tennessee, the chairman of the Naval Committee, [Mr. WIRTHORNE,] while making an examination about naval affairs, struck an account of \$23,000 with Donald McKay, in Boston, which has been refunded to the Treasury because of this very committee of investigation finding out the mistake. The investigation paid for itself and more. Altogether, I believe, there have been thus far only \$116,000 charged against investigations. If the truth were known, sir, that amount has already been paid up in full by results, and ten times over. Besides, I am informed that the Printing Committee discovered one

item of over a thousand dollars due from one firm and caused its collection, and thus more than paying all expenses of that peculiar investigation. So that directly, not to say indirectly, the discovery of wrongs is useful even in a pecuniary sense.

Mr. Chairman, I was simply going over the list of committees to show the proportion of northern to southern men upon them. I desire thus to repel the attack upon Mr. Speaker KERR, who formed them.

The next is the Committee on Mileage, on which there are three northern men to one from the South; Joint Committee on Printing, two to one; Joint Committee on Enrolled Bills, four to one; Joint Committee on the Library, two to one; Committee on Expenditures in the State Department, four to one; Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, seven to two; Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, three to two; Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, four to one; Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, two to three. I hardly see how that happened. Perhaps the Speaker thought he had been leaning too much in favor of the North and wildly changed the proportion here! The criticism the gentleman from Maine intended has on this little committee missed its mark. The Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department has four to one; Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings, six to one; Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, six to three. Yet how useful have we made all these heretofore useless committees on expenditures. They became active instruments of honesty. There was a reason for it. But does it detract from the utility because northern members predominate? The truth is, our honored Speaker only thought of honest men, and not of sections, in forming his committees.

The next is the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service. Here there are eight North to three South. God knows there is a great necessity for such a committee, as well for a reform in the civil service—not in this House and its constitution so much as all through the country, from Alaska to Georgia, from Galveston to Penobscot, or whatever part of the world the gentleman from Maine may live in. [Laughter.] Now the Committee on Mississippi Levees are four North to seven South. This, Mr. Chairman, is the third committee where there is a majority of southern men. If the gentleman from Maine himself were Speaker would he not give a majority of that committee to the South? No? Then I take him to be less fair than I always thought him to be. Why should not southern men have the Mississippi levees in their own charge for report and legislation? They were so given in the appointment of the committee by Mr. Speaker KERR; four northern men to seven southern men. Is it not their peculiar interest? They were appointed to take care of their interests just as the western men are placed on certain committees to care for territories and lands. The Committee on Rules are three to the North—four including Mr. Speaker KERR, *ex officio* a member. There is nobody on that committee except northern men. The Committee on the Centennial Celebration are eight to three; Committee on the Texas Frontier Troubles, three to two. There is a majority from the North even on a committee about Texas affairs and its troublesome border.

FREEDMEN AND THEIR ROBBERS.

Do you desire further rehearsal? The next is the Committee on the Freedman's Bank. Now I favor giving to the Freedman's Bank and its rascals a committee with a majority from the South. That is the fourth committee where the South have a prevailing majority; the members being two northern to five southern men. Why should

it not be so? Who robbed the freedmen? Was it northern men? Was it New England men? They might have had their hand in it, [Laughter] but those robbed are the laboring people South whose representatives, white and black, are here. It was right that the affairs of the Freedman's Bank should be looked into by southern men. So the chairman is Mr. DOUGLAS, of Virginia; and there are associated with him Mr. BRADFORD of Alabama, Mr. RIDDLE of Tennessee, Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi, Mr. BLISS of New York, and Mr. RAINEY of South Carolina. The latter is a good, noble, kindly colored gentleman. How could this committee have been made better? and especially may I not say so in view of the fact that there was an entire unanimity in the committee upon the subject of their report and upon the necessity of punishing the despoilers of the simple freedmen?

Then there is the Committee on Real-Estate Pool and Jay Cooke Indebtedness; the members of that committee stand two North to three South. Mr. GLOVER, of Missouri, is chairman. Is it so terrible to have him as chairman? I believe he was connected with some similar committee in a previous Congress. This is the fourth among forty-odd committees where the South predominates. Besides Mr. GLOVER, there are, Mr. LEWIS of Alabama, Mr. PRATT of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CULBERSON, of Texas. Now no one can object to the *personnel* of a committee of investigation like this; nor because they are composed of three southern and two northern members. So it seems, sir, that out of some forty committees four or five have a majority of members from the South! Is not this horribly sectional?

WHISKY AND ITS CROOKEDNESS.

Then there is the Committee on Whisky Trials in Saint Louis. Has my friend from Maine ever read the history of these whisky trials? What a trial it is to go through such crookedness! Have you read Bluford Wilson's testimony? Do you know where it strikes? It is worse than Jersey lightning when it strikes. [Laughter.] Would you have that committee made up entirely of northern men? Well, here you have it! Here are the names: Mr. KNOTT of Kentucky, Mr. PHELPS of Connecticut, Mr. GLOVER of Missouri, Mr. COCHRANE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MACMAHON of Ohio, Mr. McCRARY of Iowa, and Mr. PLAISTED of Maine. On the minority of the committee is perhaps the best lawyer on your side of the House, Mr. McCRARY. How can you complain of that as sectional? Your complaint, if any, ought to be in another direction.

Then we come to the Committee on Federal Offices in Louisiana. I think I helped to appoint that committee as Speaker *pro tempore*. It might be thought that on that committee there should be a majority of southern members. But no, the proportion of northern to southern members on that committee is six to three, and upon it is the distinguished, pertinacious, and irascible person from Michigan, Mr. CONGER. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONGER. I ask that the words of the gentleman be taken down. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. I will ask that the gentleman himself may be taken down. [Laughter.] I said nothing but what was honorable to him.

Mr. CONGER. I think it would take the whole force of the democratic party to do it.

Mr. COX. The democratic party will not exert itself in that direction very much. [Laughter.] Then there is the committee on charges against Judge Wylie which I appointed. It has five northern members and two southern members. Last, there is the committee on charges.

against the Clerk of the House, with four northern members and one southern member. So that of all these several committees, except four or five, the majority of their members have been chosen from the North.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. COX. With the greatest delight.

Mr. HALE. In making up this majority the gentleman of course includes the republican members, who are almost entirely from the North.

Mr. COX. Did not the gentleman know that when I was going over the committees?

Mr. HALE. How is it with the gentleman's political friends? Do not the members from the South constitute the majority of the democratic members on most of the committees?

Mr. COX. I think perhaps the majority of the members on the democratic side of the House are from the South, and perhaps happily for the country, in its sectional emergency.

Mr. HALE. Happily for the country?

A MEMBER. The democratic majority has the greater number from the North.

Mr. COX. That may be so. But is it anything against a man that he comes from the South, if he is a good and honest committee-man and investigator?

Mr. HALE. My point was that the high places in this House were given to these gentlemen from the South.

IS THE SOUTH IN THE UNION?

Mr. COX. I have an idea that the South is inside of the Union now. I have an idea that they intend to stay. I have an idea that they should be treated fairly. If there is to be any criticism at all made upon this list of committees, 't is that our Speaker has leaned rather against the South in making up the body of the committees, and in favor of the North. Yes, it is so; do not shake your head; there is nothing in it, unless I make a mistake. [Laughter.]

Now, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] made an elaborate and, as I have already said, a "hefty" speech on this subject, and there is no other way to answer it except by giving these simple facts.

NOW LET US CARRY THE WAR INTO AFRICA.

The Cincinnati platform says:

The national administration merits commendation for its honorable work in the management of our domestic and foreign affairs, and President Grant deserves the continued and hearty gratitude of the American people for his patriotism and immense services in war and in peace.

If that is the case, why did the distinguished ex-colleague of my friend from Maine, Mr. Blaine, speak in the way he did about such a good man as General Grant and his associates as rogues? Why did your party at Cincinnati unload him? Why are you all the time unloading? You unloaded a candidate for governor in Indiana the other day. What for? What had he done? Does no one answer? Why did you unload Ex-Secretary Bristow?

Mr. HALE. I suppose the republican party in Indiana followed the precedent of the democratic party, which had unloaded their judicial ticket.

Mr. ROBINSON. We unloaded one, and you unloaded four. Your men stole \$67,000, and your party admitted it, and unloaded them. We unloaded one, and are now 10,000 votes ahead.

Mr. COX. You see we never defend our rascals; you defend yours when they are prosecuted.

Mr. ROBINSON. You do not know how to defend them.

Mr. COX. Do not interrupt me again.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, (Mr. CLYMER in the chair.) The gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] has the floor.

Mr. COX. Certainly I have. I do not want to get up any feeling on the part of the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Maine. The speech of the latter was not worth answering. It was too small, too microscopic in its fault-finding with this House. Yet I felt bound to do so in defense of our Speaker, who is ill and absent. I would not do so if he were here, and in health to defend himself on the floor from this attack. I feel bound to justify him in this House for the unsectional course he pursued in making up the committees of the House and in the general justice of his life and character.

Mr. HALE. I made no personal reflection on the Speaker. I only claimed that he was impelled by his party.

Mr. COX. Well, now, sit down and you will feel better after that remark. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. Does the gentleman feel any better for drawing it out?

Mr. COX. Now, you know you would not allow any interruption yourself; but I allowed you to come in whenever you pleased, because it does not hurt any one. [Laughter.]

In conclusion, and in answer to the remarkable speech which we have heard, and which may be called an incarnate ineptitude, [laughter,] I say that this House cannot be reproached this session with any culpability. It is not amenable to attack for anything except the indiscretion and impropriety of some two or three of its appointees. These we promptly removed.

PUBLIC PRINTER DEFENDED.

Do you not remember that upon a resolution introduced by myself the Committee on Printing made an inquiry into the conduct of the Government Printing Office? That committee convicted your Congressional Printer; and he was discharged. Who re-appointed him? President Grant, whom you indorse in your platform. Do you indorse Mr. Clapp's administration as Printer? You were very prompt to get up a while ago. Do you indorse the appointment of Mr. Clapp as Printer to the House and Senate?

Mr. HALE. Does the gentleman want an answer? He seems to invite one.

Mr. COX. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. According to the information I have received from members of the minority who took part in that investigation, I understand that it was conducted entirely in an unfair, partisan manner, and that there was really nothing in the facts which warranted the removal of Mr. Clapp.

Mr. COX. Did not the Senate and the House, by a legislative act, agree that he ought to go out?

Mr. HALE. The House did.

Mr. COX. And the Senate concurred by its conferees. You cannot deny it.

Mr. HALE. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Senate acceded to the position taken by the House upon that report of the committee that conducted the printing investigation?

Mr. COX. I did not say that. I say that on the sundry civil bill both Houses agreed that Mr. Clapp should go out.

Mr. HALE. The Senate agreed that this office should be filled by presidential appointment; and I believe it should. I voted for that principle in the committee of conference, as I would again; and the President has re-appointed the same man.

Mr. COX. You approve of that appointment, do you? Do you indorse the appointment of Mr. Clapp?

Mr. HALE. Certainly I do.

Mr. COX. You do?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Well, that is the last feather on the camel's back. You are not the man to have made the speech you did. I might read upon you the report of the Committee on Printing and convince you that you indorse that which is very, very wrong. You ought to know better, if you have read the reports.

Mr. HALE. What does the minority report hold?

Mr. COX. O, well, we have had all that thoroughly discussed. The Senate and the House acted on it. The President has re-appointed your man; and now you indorse the Executive in putting this printing business again in his charge after the exposures made in this House.

Mr. BALLOU. The gentleman from New York has asked why Mr. Clapp was re-appointed.

Mr. COX. I cannot yield further.

Mr. BALLOU. I say that there is not a particle of evidence from the beginning of that examination to the end to show that the Public Printer was not an honest, faithful officer.

Mr. COX. How often must I try to speak without being interrupted? I have not interrupted any gentleman on the other side.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. VANCE, of Ohio. I would like to say one word, if the gentleman from New York will allow me.

Mr. COX. With the greatest pleasure.

Mr. VANCE, of Ohio. If the evidence of Mr. Clapp, the Congressional Printer, and that of one man from New York, Mr. Garner, be taken side by side they will be found to substantiate the very material charge made in the report of the majority of the Committee on Printing. To establish the majority of those charges nothing more is necessary than the testimony of Mr. Clapp himself, and that of the man in New York, from whom he made his purchases. I need not refer to the recent editorial comments of the New York Times and other leading newspapers of the country, East as well as West, and the Chronicle, of this city.

Mr. BALLOU. I wish to say there is no foundation for the statement just made by the gentleman from Ohio; there is no evidence to sustain it.

Mr. COX. I have been in this House sixteen years and have never had a chance to close a debate until this session. I have never had a chance to speak without interruption, though I scarcely ever interrupt anybody.

DISMISSAL OF COMMISSIONER PRATT AND HIS SUCCESSOR.

What I want next to say is this: Mr. Pratt was dismissed as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, was he not? At least indirectly? Am I right?

A MEMBER. He resigned.

A MEMBER. Do not interrupt him.

Mr. COX. Why don't you come forward, if you want to? [Laughter.] Who was put in his place? A General Boum. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. No, Raum, of Illinois.

Mr. COX. Well, Mr. Raum, of Illinois, was put in his place. What is he known for? For sending a dispatch about the whisky trials.

That is all I can recollect about him, except that he was in one of our Congresses, which was not very creditable. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONGER. The gentleman has been here sixteen years and ought to remember his colleagues.

Mr. COX. Can I not have my chance on the floor without interruption?

Mr. CONGER. He has been with the gentleman on this floor and he ought to remember him.

Mr. COX. I was not in that Congress and do not know anything about him. All I know of him is the fact that he did congratulate the men who were engaged in crooked matters in Saint Louis. Do you approve of putting him in and turning such a man as Judge Pratt out? Do you suppose the people of Indiana who know Judge Pratt approve of that? Everybody in Indiana who knows Judge Pratt, respects him as an honest man. I have known him myself to act in relations of private trust. He is known as the honest man. Almost singular in that State, and in that respect, is he thus known. But you could not stand him in that very remarkable Department. [Laughter.] Why?

GENERAL RAUM AND THE CROOKED DISPATCH.

Mr. CONGER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him if he knows anything in the world in the character or reputation of Mr. Raun that is not that of a high-minded, honorable, and honest man?

Mr. COX. I have said that all I know of him in the world is a printed dispatch in relation to these whisky trials which he sent as a congratulation.

Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois. The gentleman must remember that he was a gallant officer in the Union Army.

Mr. GARFIELD. The gentleman from New York ought to remember that he served in Congress with us.

Mr. COX. He may have been a good member of Congress, though I think I never served with him. But I have known good members of Congress turn out afterward to be very bad men. [Laughter.] I do not say he was not a good member of Congress, but I do say that all I know about him is the congratulations to the crooked people at Saint Louis. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois. He was in the Union Army.

Mr. COX. He may have been a good soldier. I do not say anything against the soldier. What I say is that Judge Pratt was somehow turned out and another gentleman put in his place, and all I know of the man put in his place is that he sent this congratulatory telegraphic dispatch. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me in that connection and for this reason—

Mr. COX. To vindicate anything personal, I will.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. Not at all; but General Raun is from my State.

Mr. COX. Yes, sir; I know that.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. I merely wish to say this: He is well known in my State, and there is not a man in Illinois who has a better reputation as an honest man and an able man than General Raun.

Mr. COX. But is it not so of Judge Pratt, of Indiana?

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. I understand so.

Mr. COX. Then why is one put out and the other put in? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. I am not speaking of that matter. I am only speaking as a citizen of Illinois and as a Representative of Illi-

nois, and defending General Raum against the imputation the gentleman makes against his character.

Mr. COX. I did not make any imputation, sir; I know nothing of him, except so far as that dispatch is concerned.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. Then I have nothing to say.

Mr. COX. Of course you have nothing to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. I have only defended him.

AN UNUSUAL ARRANGEMENT FOR INTERPELLATIONS.

Mr. COX. Don't you shake your finger at me that way. [Laughter.] I will get scared if you do. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. With the permission of the gentleman—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York has the floor and will proceed without interruption.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will agree to put his hands in his pockets, he can go on. [Great laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has the floor, and will proceed.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois, rose.

Mr. COX. My friend must speak, if at all, by following my request and condition, and putting his hands in his pocket. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. I have both my hands in my pockets now. [Laughter.] And I only want to say—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. COX. I will yield for one remark only.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. I wish to say this: I did not seek to interrupt the gentleman to make any point or to attempt to make any point, if I were capable of doing so. I do not often interrupt gentlemen on the floor of this House; but when the gentleman makes a remark by innuendo—

THE ARRANGEMENT BROKEN.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has his hand out of his pocket and is shaking his finger at me again. [Great laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York has the floor and must not be interrupted. The Chair will not permit it any longer.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. Now, if the gentleman thinks that is very courteous or smart—

Mr. COX. I claim the floor after that remark. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. The gentleman ought not to cut me off that way, although he has the right to do it.

Mr. COX. When you abuse my courtesy I want you to be quietly seated while I proceed with my remarks.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. Very well, if you decline to yield further—

Mr. COX. I have yielded to you more than I ever did to any man for the same amount of frivolous idea.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. Thank you.

WHY GOVERNOR JEWELL WENT OUT.

Mr. COX. Now, again, I want to know why Governor Jewell of Connecticut was compelled to resign. What was that for? Because he said the country would not stand these strange removals and this curious conduct; nothing else. And yet the gentleman from Illinois and others defend the administration of General Grant. Not one of them dare to go back upon the resolution of indorsement of General

Grant at Cincinnati. Not one of the whole of that side of the House has yet been heard to take back one word of that platform eulogy touching General Grant—

Mr. WELLS, of Mississippi, rose.

Mr. COX. And his services in peace as well as in war. A gentleman over there shakes his head. He does not believe in the Administration?

Mr. WELLS, of Mississippi. I do. I do not take back one word.

THE ADMINISTRATION INDORSED.

Mr. COX. Then you come within my category. Not a man on that side has failed to defend the Administration. Not one. That was my remark. You all stand by it. And thereby you stand by the removal of Pratt; you stand by the removal of the collector at Philadelphia who bore the same relation as Bristow and Wilson, and the appointment of another in his place who bore a different relation. You stand by the accepted resignation and acquittal of Belknap. You stand by the enforced resignation of Bristow. You stand by the removal of Jewell. You stand by the removal of Bluford Wilson; of Yaryan, [laughter;] of all that class of men who were trying to punish the guilty and uphold the laws. Is there any one to challenge this remark? You have favored to-day the retention of General Babcock in office, as well as in your platform, by the indorsement of the Administration. You have to-day on the floor showed yourselves in favor of the retention of the Public Printer, Mr. Clapp, who has been recommended for indictment. All through this beautiful civil-service business, from one end of it to the other, you have manfully stood up for the Cincinnati platform indorsing the Administration. I honor you for it. Why should you not? General Grant is your representative man. Babcock and Belknap are your representative men. Bristow is not your representative man, or he would not have been discarded here and at Cincinnati.

When you say it has cost a million dollars for investigation this session you thereby give that amount of credit to the democratic party and to this side of the House for undertaking with all the energy of Hercules to clean out the Augean stables.

Now, sir, why is it when we are closing up the session you filibuster, as on yesterday, again and again, to prevent a full and prompt report of these investigations? Why is it that, failing to stop these reports, you try to make up to-day for your gross delinquencies as public servants by trivial excuses and small assaults on the constitution and conduct of this body? Why does the gentleman from Maine make that sort of a speech which Mirabeau once designated when he described hasty will-making—“*Ab irato, ab imbecilli, a territo, a delirante.*”

Mr. HOLMAN. Give us the translation.

Mr. COX. A speech angry, imbecile, fearful, and crazy. With that classic remark I conclude.







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 786 594 4

